REMARKS

Interview Summary

Examiner Jagannathan is thanked for the telephone interviews had with the undersigned attorney on September 26, 2006 ("first interview") and October 20, 2006 ("second" interview). In the first interview, differences between applicants' invention and Arango were discussed. In the second interview, amendments to claims 25 and 30 proposed by applicants were discussed and the examiner expressed the view that, subject to further thought and review, those amendments seemed to render claims 25 and 30 allowable. Also discussed was the possibility that applicants might amend claim 32 to more particularly emphasize the differences between applicants' invention and Arango. Also discussed was applicants' view that it was not possible to read claims such as claim 55 on Arango or on any obvious modification thereof.

Minor Claim Amendments

Claims 44, 77 and 79 have been amended to substitute "resources" for "capacity," thereby securing closer correspondence to the recitation of "resources" elsewhere in claim 44 and in parent claim 55 of claims 77 and 79.

Claim Amendments Render Claims 25-27, 30, 32-34 Clearly Allowable

In this Response to Office Action, applicants have amended claims 25 and 30 per the amendments proposed in the second interview. The examiner is understood to believe that, subject to further consideration and review, these amendments preclude the claims reading on Arango by making clear that the indications from, for example, the called party that are communicated to the third packet network (illustratively the backbone network of the illustrative embodiment) are communicated independently of the indication communicated by the calling party, as they are communicated via different network edge devices. In Arango, by contrast, as will be recalled, all indications communicated to the backbone network to reserve resources are sent from one of the parties and thus not through different network edge devices..

Claim 32 was rejected on the grounds that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to "modify the on-demand set-up of communication channels for access points in Arango to reserve bandwidth for hosts at different times." Whether or not that approach, standing alone, would be known or obvious, applicants' claim 32 says more. The claim says that while capacity in the *backbone* packet network for transmit and receive directions of communication is reserved at *different* times, the claim further says that capacity in the *access* packet network for transmit and receive directions of communication is reserved at the *same* time. See lines 9-15 of unamended claim 32. The cited prior art neither shows nor renders obvious this "mix and match" approach recited in the claims wherein, as just noted, backbone network capacity is reserved at different times for transmit and receive directions over that network while access network capacity is reserved at the *same* time for transmit and receive directions over *that* network.

Applicants understood the examiner to suggest in the second interview that, beyond the ground of rejection set forth in the Office action, it might be possible to read claim 32 on Arango if one takes account of the possibility that "different" times as recited in the claim could read on a case where reserving for the two directions on the backbone network happens essentially in one operation but at just slightly different times. While not necessarily agreeing with such a reading, applicants have nonetheless amended claim 32 in the interest of further prosecution.

In particular, amended claim 32 recites that the reserving is carried out in response to the backbone network receiving first and second requests relative to the transmit and receive directions, respectively, and that, moreover, those two requests are received by the backbone network in "first and second separate messages" received from "respective different network entities." Those entities, in applicants' illustrative embodiment, are applicants' network edge devices. In Arango, by contrast, any reservation requests for bandwidth in the two directions on the backbone network are received by the backbone network in a *single* message, not in "separate messages" as claim 32 recites. Moreover, any messages for reserving backbone network capacity in Arango are received from the same network entity or entities. This is in contrast the claim 32's recitation that the first and second separate messages are received from "respective *different* network entities [emphasis added]."

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 25, 30 and 32, as well as all claims that depend from them, distinguish the invention over the cited prior art. Thus allowance of those claims—claims 25-27, 30, 32-34—is earnestly solicited.

Rejection of Claims 38-40, 42-43, 55-62 and 65-80 Is Traversed

In the second interview, applicants pointed out limitations (as discussed below) in independent claim 55 that applicants believe preclude reading that claim on Arango and thus on any obvious combination of Arango with Roy and/or Hin. Upon further review of the claims after the interview, applicants realized those same limitations, or limitations of similar import, are also contained in independent claims 38, 68, and 74. Accordingly, the rejection of all of these claims, and thus also all claims depend from them, is respectfully traversed, this then being claims 38-40, 42-43, 55-62 and 65-80.

In particular, each of these claims includes limitations that has a "reserve message," "resource reservation message" being received over an access network or, in some of the claims, a "first network." That message, once received over the access (or first) network, serves as the basis for reserving resources over both the access network and the backbone network (or both the first network and the second network). That functionality is illustratively carried out in applicants' embodiment by applicants' disclosed router(s) or other network edge device(s) at the network edge. Applicants find no such functionality in Arango, taken alone or taken in any obvious combination with any other prior art. That is to say, any resource reserve message that is sent over the access network in Arango only causes backbone network resources to be reserved.

Certain of these claims further distinguish the invention from Arango for at least a reason discussed hereinabove relative to claim 32. That is, whether or not, as the Office action asserts, it would have been obvious to modify Arango to reserve resources at different times for the transmit and receive directions for the *backbone network*, these claims go further, reciting not only that, but also reciting that the resources for the transmit and receive directions are reserved at the *same time* for the *access* network. See, for example, the following recitations: Claim 38, lines 4-7; claim 42, lines 4-8; claim 77, lines 2-9; claim 79, lines 2-9. Again, no such "mix and match" approach is shown or suggested in Arango or in any obvious combination of Arango with the other cited references.

Serial No. 09/469,791 Docket No.: 113335F

Rejection of Claims 44-54 Is Traversed

Independent claim 44 contains some of the distinguishing limitations discussed in the previous section and thus claim 44 and its dependent claims 45-54 are submitted to be allowable. In particular, although claim 44 does not recite that the reserve message is received over an access network, it does include the feature that resources of both a first network and a backbone network get reserved responsive to a single reserve message.

Claim 44 further includes limitations directed to the above-discussed feature of the invention wherein in response to the reserve message, a capacity is reserved in the first packet network for *both directions* of the call whereas in response to that same reserve message, capacity in the backbone network is reserved for only *one direction* of the call.

Although claim 44 does not recite that the reserve message is received over an access network, claim 51, which is dependent from claim 44, *does* recite that the method of claim 44 is performed by "an originating network edge device connected to both the first packet network and the backbone packet network." Again, there is no teaching in Arango or any obvious combination of Arango with other references, that a network edge device situated between some first packet network and a backbone packet network carries out a method wherein, in response to a single reserve message, capacity is reserved in both networks.

Claim 53 contains similar recitations vis-à-vis a terminating edge device.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Charles R. Kalmanek, Jr. et al

By: _____
Ronald D. Slusky,
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,585
(212) 246-4546

Office of Ronald D. Slusky
Registered Patent Attorney
353 West 56th Street—Suite 5L
New York, N.Y. 10019-3775
Date: 10/31/2006